

REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 17, 2006 has been carefully considered. Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 16 and 19 have been amended. Claims 11-15 have been canceled. Claims 1-10 and 16-20 are in this application.

Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found throughout the specification and in particular on page 6, lines 1-14. No new matter has been entered.

Claims 1 and 16 were objected to as informal. Claims 1 and 16 have been amended to obviate the Examiner's objection.

The previously presented claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the Examiner indicated the claims only make allowances for when the identifier to the first policy is in the list of policies to which the second agent can operate. Applicants have amended the claims to include the limitation of ignoring the message at the second controller when the identifier to the first policy of the message is not in the list of policies to which the second agent can operate. Accordingly, the claim does not include open ended language. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The previously presented claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,510,513 to Danieli. Applicants submit that Danieli does not include each of the limitations of the present claims.

Danieli discloses validation and authentication of electronic data exchange between pairs of clients. A single trusted arbitrator is used to mediate the exchange. In particular, a first client, an author or originator of electronic data, generates a digest of the data using a one-way hashing algorithm, creates a request for a security certificate specifying type of security and policy level, and sends the security certificate request and digest to the server of a trusted arbitrator. The server authenticates the first client, registers, timestamps and logs the certificate and digest, and returns an electronically signed confirmation receipt to the first client. The confirmation receipt contains the digest and the first client can optionally insert the receipt into the security certificate. The first client combines the security certificate with the data, and distributes the combination as a distribution unit. A second client, a user, acquires the distribution unit, extracts the data from the distribution unit, and generates a digest from the data using the same hashing algorithm.

When the security certificate contains the digest generated by the first client, the second client compares the digests. If the digests match, the distribution unit acquired by the user is valid. If the digests do not match, the file cannot be validated.

In contrast to the invention defined by the present claims, Danieli does not teach or suggest assigning a first controller to a first agent, the first controller accessing a first list of policies to which the first agent can interoperate and assigning a second controller to a second agent, the second controller accessing a second list of policies to which the second agent can interoperate. Further, Danieli does not teach or suggest exporting a message from the first agent to the second controller by the first controller, the message including an identifier to the first policy and importing the message from the second controller to the second agent under the second policy when the identifier to the first policy of the message is in the list of policies to which the second agent can interoperate or ignoring the message at the second controller when the identifier to the first policy of the message is not in the list of policies to which the second agent can operate. The present invention provides interoperability between two agents each operating under different policies the policies can be very general access control policies. In contrast, Danieli operates under a single arbitrator to mediate only data exchange. The present invention provides a far more general operation to provide interoperability for two agents each operating under a different policy. There is no teaching or suggestion in Danieli of operating using two agents each operating under a different policy as defined by the present claims. Accordingly, rather the teachings of Danieli are very different and the invention defined by the present claims is not anticipated by Danieli.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and request that all claims be allowed. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should he believe that this would expedite prosecution of this application. It is believed that no fee is required. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2165.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 16, 2007



Diane Dunn McKay, Esq.
Reg. No. 34,586
Attorney for Applicant

MATHEWS, SHEPHERD, McKAY & BRUNEAU, P.A.
29 Thanet Road, Suite 201
Princeton, NJ 08540
Tel: 609 924 8555
Fax: 609 924 3036